

From: llegere@timeshamrock.com
Sent: 3/16/2012 4:27:39 PM
To: "Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA" <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov>
CC:
Subject: Re: Dimock results

Thanks very much, Roy.

Best,

Laura

On Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 4:23 PM, Roy Seneca <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov> wrote:

Laura -- Sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

Is there any indication that the results released yesterday are representative of the 60 or so homes sampled? In particular, does the entire body of test results in Dimock indicate that the water poses no health risks?

These are the sampling results from first 11 homes that were tested during the week of Jan. 23. EPA is not drawing any conclusions at this time.

Does the EPA plan to continue to release partial public summaries of the Dimock data as new batches of tests are returned to homeowners?

EPA is planning to release sampling results to the home owners on a weekly basis in the order in which the homes were sampled. Our sampling effort began the week of January 23rd and continued for three and half weeks through February 15th. At this time we are providing results on the 11 wells sampled during the week of January 23rd. Overall, we sampled water from 61 homes to date. We have also completed a residential well survey and have now identified 68 homes in the study area that could be sampled and have worked to offer sampling to all those homes. Some residents were unavailable for sampling during our initial effort. We will be working with them to offer and schedule sampling at their homes.

The Action Memo for Dimock outlines several contaminants detected in wells during past (non-EPA) sampling, including five -- barium, manganese, phenol, DEHP, glycol compounds -- that were not mentioned in the statement yesterday. Were these compounds detected in the first 11 wells sampled? Our sampling did identify low levels of manganese in one home, and low levels of barium were also identified in some samples. Our sampling did not identify any of the other chemicals you mentioned. The Action Memo also describes that past tests "identify the existence of hazardous substances" in Dimock water supplies including and outside of those four homes provided with alternate sources of water. Did the EPA tests for the first 11 wells confirm or disprove the existence of hazardous substances in those 11 wells?

As noted in our statement, sampling results from these 11 homes did not show levels of contamination that could present a health concern. Samples from six of the 11 homes did show concentrations of sodium, methane, chromium or bacteria, but concentrations were all within the safe range for drinking water. The sampling results also identified the presence of arsenic at two homes.

Roy Seneca

EPA Region 3 Press Officer

Office of Public Affairs

seneca.roy@epa.gov

(215) 814-5567

From: Laura Legere <llegere@timeshamrock.com>
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 03/16/2012 10:26 AM
Subject: Dimock results

Hi Roy and Terri,

I had a few follow-up questions relating to the statement regarding the first round of Dimock test results yesterday:

Is there any indication that the results released yesterday are representative of the 60 or so homes sampled? In particular, does the entire body of test results in Dimock indicate that the water poses no health risks?

Does the EPA plan to continue to release partial public summaries of the Dimock data as new batches of tests are returned to homeowners?

The Action Memo for Dimock outlines several contaminants detected in wells during past (non-EPA) sampling, including five -- barium, manganese, phenol, DEHP, glycol compounds -- that were not mentioned in the statement yesterday. Were these compounds detected in the first 11 wells sampled?

The Action Memo also describes that past tests "identify the existence of hazardous substances" in Dimock water supplies including and outside of those four homes provided with alternate sources of water. Did the EPA tests for the first 11 wells confirm or disprove the existence of hazardous substances in those 11 wells?

Thanks again for your help. I'm hoping to write about this for tomorrow.

Best,

Laura Legere

Staff Writer

Scranton Times-Tribune

570-348-9100 x 5184

llegere@timeshamrock.com